

REMARKS

In the action of June 9, 2008, the examiner rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-2 and 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Meyer; rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Sale *et al*; and rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as unpatentable over Gruber.

Initially, note that claim 11 has been amended to include a “stem body portion” and “stem core portion”. This is believed to alleviate any possible confusion in the original language.

Further note that claims 1 and 11 have been amended to clarify that the stem body and the internal core member have grooves in their inner and outer surfaces, respectively, which together form channels which extend to the bristle plate. None of the references teach such a specific structure. Meyer teaches grooves in one embodiment (Figures 6 and 7) in a conduit member 32 (col.5, l. 5-16). However, there are no matching grooves in bristle carrier 3. Hence, there are no channels as defined in claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Meyer.

Sale teaches a fluid delivery tunnel 65 within which a tube 66 resides (col 4, l. 24-26). Tube 66 is mated to a duckbill seal 67. There is no teaching of a stem body member with an internal core member each of which have longitudinal grooves therein which combine to define fluid channels for a dental cleaning apparatus. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Sale.

Although claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, the follow-on language indicates that the basis would more likely be 35 U.S.C. §103. Also, the reference to “Wallace” is not understood. While Gruber does teach two separate channels 14 and 24, there is no teaching of the claimed subject matter, specifically mating grooves in a stem body portion and a stem core portion which mate together to define fluid channels. Gruber’s channels are two separate tube elements. Hence, claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Gruber in combination with any of the other applied references.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 11 are allowable. Since claims 3-10 and 12 depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively, those claims are also allowable. However, note in addition, claims 6, 7 and 8, which specify (claims 6 and 7) ribs on the internal core portion mating and slots in the inner surface of the stem portion to provide fluid-tight seals between the channels. Claim 8 specifies ribs which are welded to the stem motor. There is no teaching or suggestion of such a structure in Meyer. Accordingly, those claims are independently patentable over Meyer.

In view of the above, allowance of the application is now requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JENSEN & PUNTIGAM, P.S.

By Clark A. Puntigam
Clark A. Puntigam #25,763
Attorney for Applicant

CAP:rm1